University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
of the 10/2/14 meeting


Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Kevin Gibson, Scott Mandernack (LIBR)

Excused: T. Gerry Bradley, Robert Griffin, Stephen Saunders

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports:

Graduate Dean –
Dr. Hossenlopp encouraged members to attend the President’s Open Forum on October 14th in the Weasler Auditorium. Topics for discussion include innovation and how to use innovation funds, as well as a discussion about the global water center.

Dr. Hossenlopp also reported on the CGS Workshop she took part in earlier this week, which focused on career pathways for PhD students – understanding current status of where they go and what their career progression steps are in order to improve curricula and other support mechanism. MU will be part of national work on this. There was some discussion on how to improve tracking of graduates and suggestions to use student employees to help track grads through social media.

Graduate Associate Dean –
Dr. Gibson reported that the PFP program is working well so far. Last week the GSO social had over 100 students in attendance and a sense of community is being formed.

UBGS Chair –
Dr. Caulfield reported that an INPR outline will come to the board for review next month. The closing of the Dispute Resolution program will also appear on next month’s agenda, along with a library presentation from John Jentz regarding assigning a library liaison to INPR students. Any other agenda ideas should be sent to her.

Business:

UBGS Purpose, Responsibilities & Membership –
A document was sent to members ahead of time. There were no comments or questions. It was recommended to attach the document to the membership list on an annual basis.

Library Electronic Journal Resources – Update provided by Scott Mandernack, Associate Dean for Scholarly Resources and Collections –

Mr. Mandernack presented a pie chart diagram of the library’s budget. The chart showed how the materials budget is allocated for different types of library resources. Electronic resources (e-book collections) comprise 6% of the budget, while E-serials (i.e., online
Journal subscriptions) comprise 54%. He explained that E-serials are purchased out of operating funds while print serials are purchased with capital funds. Mr. Mandernack also shared the serials budget for last 6 years and explained that increasing costs are making it difficult to keep up with e-serials.

In 2013, there were cuts to the budget for e-serials, which led to the cancellation of some subscriptions. A letter was sent to deans to explain the proposed cancellations. The criteria for cancellation of an e-serial included: cost, usage, cost per use, curricular and research needs, overlapping coverage, and faculty review. The library had 21,000 e-journal subscriptions and needed to cut $300,000 from the budget. Mr. Mandernack explained how some titles were back-migrated, which means the library switched back to bundled subscriptions that included a print form and an online subscription. These bundles are covered in the capital budget not the operating budget.

More print subscriptions will be cancelled also while the library looks for more open access publications. He expects the cancellations to continue without any additional resources. Meanwhile, publishers are trying to get funds from both sides – institutions and authors (to pay for open access). There was some discussion about budgetary concerns and how these cuts affect faculty.

It was noted that interlibrary loans have improved, and the library is on the lookout for consortia to join. He asked members to help make faculty aware that articles that we do not have online access to can be ordered through interlibrary loan. When an electronic journal has been canceled, in most instances we have access to the journal’s articles previous to cancellation.

Members discussed how the budget department (and advancement) can be made to understand the importance of a library to the university, and there was some discussion regarding capital and operating budgets. It was suggested that this question should be brought up to candidates in the provost search.

It was noted that there is reciprocal access with UWM for faculty (onsite), and suggested to explore reciprocal online access with UWM, and the CTSI. Lastly, members commented that the library staff has been very gracious to faculty who are upset about cuts.

Academic Program Structures – presentation by Kevin Gibson, Associate Dean of the Graduate School and Associate Professor –

Dr. Gibson used a PowerPoint presentation to demonstrate the available Accelerated Degree Programs (ADP's) at Marquette and explained the difference in “joint” and “dual” degrees. (Dual is two degrees, joint is one.) He went on to explain the advantages of an ADP program. Members wondered if the value of the ADP can be demonstrated, and if the efficacy of programs and future of grads be tracked. It was noted that Biomedical Engineering guarantees all ADP students are funded as RA’s or TA’s in the 5th year.

Committee discussion regarding the notes from the March 27, 2014 joint UBGS-COR faculty forum to assist in determining the most effective forum to invite participation of the President and/or Deans -

Members agree they would find it helpful to have President Lovell in the room during the forum. Also, having the Deans in the room would ensure that all departmental levels are
hearing the same information. Members agree that the agenda should be narrowed to 5 discussion topics. Members discussed that an outcome should be established as well as the commitment of the deans and president to take action on the 5 topics. It was also discussed to include the provost. There was opinion to invite deans to attend, but not to be on a panel. Members agreed to establish the 5 topics, and then decide whether it should be a joint forum and decide whether the president should be invited. It was recommended that the topics be selected from the joint COR/UBGS faculty session last spring. In the meantime, a date will be determined as well as the president’s availability.

*INPR proposal* – to be presented at the next meeting. No subcommittee is necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 3:46pm